

## REMARKS

Applicant requests reconsideration and further examination of this application.

Applicant herewith submits through the undersigned agent a Terminal Disclaimer to Obviate a Double Patenting Rejection. The Terminal Disclaimer disclaims the patent term that might extend beyond the term of Patent 6,277,292, which is commonly owned with this patent application. This answers the Double Patenting Rejection of Claims 1 - 9.

Applicant has amended Claims 5 and 6 to each include the limitations of their base claim. There are no rejections of these claims except the double patenting rejection, and Applicant believes that these claims are now allowable. Applicant also believes that the dependent Claims 7 and 8, which are dependent upon Claim 6, are now allowable.

Regarding independent Claim 1, Applicant has amended the claim to clarify that the filter has a top end with a filter inlet and a bottom end with a filter outlet, and that the step of forcing liquid through the first zone is a step of forcing liquid through the filter inlet and only through the first zone of the filter cavity.

Applicant argues that Claim 1 is novel and unobvious in view of the cited *Petrucci* patent, as Claim 1 includes limitations not disclosed in *Petrucci* patent in its Abstract or elsewhere. In Claim 1, liquid is forced into a top filter inlet and through only the first zone, near the top end of the filter, before being collected at the first zone outlet and conducted to a storage tank. Then, the stored liquid is returned from said storage tank to the fluid outlet of the first zone, without allowing the liquid to flow through the first zone media or the second zone media, and then is forced through said second zone and out of the filter through the filter outlet in the bottom of the filter.

On the other hand, *Petrucci* discloses forcing liquid through a first and second zone and removing the liquid out of the bottom of the filter for storage. Then, the liquid is conducted back to the filter to flow only through the second zone but does so by flowing into the port at the bottom of the filter, up through the second zone, and out of the filter via a central return tube. This is very different from Applicant's invention as claimed in Claim 1, and there is no teaching

unit and also through the secondary filter unit . . . .” Therefore, Applicant argues that Claim 1 and its dependent Claims 2-4 and 9 are novel and unobvious and allowable.

Applicant now believes the application is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests the same.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara S. Pedersen Date: August 26, 2003

Ken J. Pedersen, Registration No. 29,689

Barbara S. Pedersen, Registration No. 36,237

P.O. Box 2666

Boise, ID 83701-2666

Telephone: 208-343-6355

Facsimile: 208-343-6341